

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated February 8, 2006, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 are now all the claims pending in the application. Applicant has amended claim 4 to be consistent with page 9, lines 1-9 of the Applicant's specification. Applicant has amended claim 10 to be consistent with page 9, lines 9-20 of the Applicant's specification.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7 and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ditzik (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,073; hereinafter "Ditzik").

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

"a radiotelephone terminal which is complementary to said portable radiotelephone terminal, **configured to remain in place**, said radiotelephone terminal further configured **to be used conjointly with said portable terminal** when connected to said relay transceiver station **by a call set up via said station.**"

The Examiner asserts that Fig. 1 of Ditzik discloses that the wireless communication means 51 of the notebook computer teaches the claimed radiotelephone terminal. However, the notebook computer of Ditzik is not configured to remain in place. Specifically, this is contrary to the teachings of Ditzik. Ditzik is directed to a portable notebook computer that can be easily carried. See col. 4, lines 13-17.

Further, there is no teaching or suggestion that the wireless communication means 51 (radiotelephone terminal as cited by the Examiner) is used conjointly with wireless unit 14

(portable terminal as cited by the Examiner) when connected to said relay transceiver station by a call set up via said station. As discussed on for example, page 6, lines 3-25, of the Applicant's specification, the portable terminal and the radiotelephone terminal are used simultaneously and conjointly during a call and both the portable terminal and the radiotelephone terminal can be used in responding to the same call. Therefore, since Ditzik does not teach or suggest that the wireless communication means 51 and the wireless unit 14 are used conjointly when connected to a relay transceiver station by a call set up by the station, Ditzik does not teach this aspect of the claim.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable. To the extent claim 7 recites similar elements, claim 7 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 4

Claim 4 recites:

“wherein the transceiver means enables the portable terminal to communicate by radio with the relay transceiver station of the communication network via a first link, and with a radiotelephone terminal via a second link **when the portable terminal is within radio range of both the relay transceiver station and the radiotelephone terminal.**”

The Examiner asserts that col. 5, line 33 to col. 6, line 46 of Ditzik teaches this aspect of the claim. The respective column and lines cited by the Examiner disclose that the notebook computer includes a keyboard section, a battery power unit and a cover section. Further, that the telephone 14 and the computer system can be operated independently. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that Ditzik is concerned as to whether the telephone 14 is within radio range of extended wide area communications network 33 (relay transceiver station as cited by

the Examiner) and wireless communication means 51 (radiotelephone terminal as cited by the Examiner).

For at least the above reasons, claim 4 should be deemed allowable.

II. New Claims

Applicant has added claims 14-17 to provide a more varied scope of protection. Claims 14-17 should be deemed allowable by virtue for their dependency to claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, the art cited by the Examiner does not teach the elements of claims 14-17.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 8 and 9 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has not rewritten claims 8 and 9 in independent form since Applicant believes claims 8 and 9 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/740,784

Attorney Docket No. Q62359

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

Date: May 8, 2007